UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/699,665	11/04/2003	Christophe Gustave	ALC 3096	6478	
KRAMER & A	7590 03/11/200 MADO, P.C.	EXAMINER			
Suite 240 1725 Duke Street Alexandaria, VA 22314			LANIER, BENJAMIN E		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				2432	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/11/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/699,665	GUSTAVE ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	BENJAMIN E. LANIER	2432				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 No	ovember 2008					
	<u> </u>					
<i>i</i> —	, 					
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
•						
	4) Claim(s) <u>1,4-6 and 9</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,4-6 and 9</u> is/are rejected. 7)□ Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
·= · · ·	alastian requirement					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	epted or b) \square objected to by the E	Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some coll None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal P					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:						

Application/Control Number: 10/699,665 Page 2

Art Unit: 2432

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 10 November 2008, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY

REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37

CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an

appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee

can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have

been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between

the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing

below:

/Gilberto Barron Jr./

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2432

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and are persuasive. The previous

rejections have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 2432

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 5. Claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bianco, U.S. Patent No. 6,256,737, in view of Riley, Data Abstraction and Structures Using C++. Referring to claims 1, 4, 5, 9, Bianco discloses a biometric authentication system wherein users are biometrically authenticated based upon a biometric policy that requires the user to authenticated by a particular number of biometric devices with corresponding biometric device ids (Col. 23, lines 4-29), which meets the limitation of at an authentication server connected in said communication system defining a list of authentication module available in said communication system, and mapping said authentication modules to authenticating domain identifiers associated to end-user clients of said authentication server, wherein said authenticating domain identifiers each comprise an application service identifier, the authentication service includes local and remote services, the local and remote services include biometric schemes. The user submits biometric data using a biometric device specified in the biometric policy (Col. 24, lines 23-40), which meets the limitation of sending, by an end-user client, a respective authentication domain identifier to said authentication server. The system determines whether the user is authenticated based upon the combined results of all the biometric

Art Unit: 2432

devices specified in the biometric policy (Col. 24, lines 32-56), which meets the limitation of rendering an authentication service provided at said respective authentication module to produce an authentication result for that entry, and consolidating authentication results to obtain an authentication status for the end-user client. Bianco does not disclose the use of a stack for the biometric inputs. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to try implementing the biometric inputs of Bianco in a stack because Riley shows that stacks are one of a finite number of identified data structures that can be implemented in a predictable manner (Riley: Page 169, Figure 4.1).

Referring to claim 6, Bianco discloses utilizing session keys (Col. 51, lines 13-16), which meets the limitation of sending a unique session identifier to the end-user client responsive to an authentication status corresponding to a successful authentication.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BENJAMIN E. LANIER whose telephone number is (571)272-3805. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/699,665 Page 5

Art Unit: 2432

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Benjamin E Lanier/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2432